

## Re: There is no .NET in Vista Code?

---

*Source:*

<http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2006-03/msg04336.html>

---

- *From:* Lurkio <[spam?@no.thanks](mailto:spam?@no.thanks)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 24 Mar 2006 13:22:30 +0000
- 

I.P. Nichols wrote:

"Lurkio" wrote:

I.P. Nichols wrote:

Yes, but the points I am making (and those of the article I linked to) about .NET aren't rants against Microsoft /per se/ (although I /am/ an admitted sceptic <g>) but expressions of concern at serious flaws we see in the design of the framework. If those points are fatuous then by all means tear them apart but complaining about alleged bias and immediately jumping to negative conclusions regarding the authors credentials makes it look all the more like they've hit the target and that you don't have an answer to their questions...

I don't remember Joel's rant as asking specific questions but mostly complaints but if the question was "why can't I have a linker" then I gave an answer to that question but I didn't say you would agree.

As for my immediately jumping to negative conclusion – give me a break – upon reading his article I knew he didn't have a valid point about absolutely needing Microsoft to supply a linker. Which BTW seems to be what you keep coming back to and my answer to you is go try one of the available linkers and see if you like it.

I already answered your point about looking at third-party linkers and told you that I found them to be expensive and not officially endorsed by Microsoft – in fact, I had come around to a point where I would /agree with you/ that they go against how the whole framework was designed in the first place – which is why I provided a link to the justification for this provided by an MS insider.

My linking to Joels article was less about the need for a

Re: There is no .NET in Vista Code?

linker (which /you/ keep coming back to accusing me off saying) than the potential pitfalls and problems of deploying the run-time re-distributable – which you don't seem to want to acknowledge.

I definitely take your point about the validity of the capability to seamlessly "float up" from 32-bit to 64-bit (though having seen first hand how plenty of un-tethered .NET apps seem to break when floating up to the latest framework version, I would want to see this in action before betting my mortgage on it <g>) but you fail to acknowledge /my/ central point about the fact that /there is no single, monolithic entity called .NET/ that a developer can safely assume will be available on the target customer machine.

Of course I can't guarantee what may or may not be on someone's machine but I damn well can have my app test and report what's on his machine and make recommendations if they need to install the runtime.

....and that frankly does the square root of nothing in removing the deployment problem of the re-distributable run-time. What does your message say, "OK, you don't have the run-time installed but I'll let you off from installing it just this once" ? :-P

The spiffy new 32bit application you've tied to 1.1 can't very well seamlessly float up to 64bit when the target machine has only got 2.0 on it now, can it ? :-P

I don't have a 64bit machine to test on so I can't swear it will happen but do believe that a well designed 1.1 would seamlessly float up to .NET 2.0 – 64bit.

You keep implying that it's almost a certainty that a 1.1 apps will break on 2.0 but all my experience and that of lots of others don't reach that conclusion.

I /never/ said that it was "almost a certainty" but the fact of the matter is that the /whole purpose/ of Microsoft allowing you to tie your application to a specific framework version is to prevent such a scenario happening because they \*do not guarantee absolute backwards compatibility\* between framework versions.

What they are saying is that if you let your application float up to use the latest version, they \*will not\* guarantee that

## Re: There is no .NET in Vista Code?

it won't break – on your own head be it. The corollary of this is that if there is another application on a target machine that does float up, your own program can unwittingly break it if you are tied to (and therefore install) a later framework version with breaking changes – and as far as the customer is concerned it is /your/ fault even though you have did everything right and it was the other guys code that was taking all the chances !!!

I had this happen on my machine when the installation of an application tied to 1.1 broke an application that floated up from 1.0...and ironically enough it was Microsoft's free Web Matrix application that was the one that broke :-0

To again make sure I'm on firm ground I ran a little

> experiment this <snip home install success story>

Good for you, I hope you feel better now :-)

Are you going to go around all of your customers machines and do the same for them ? :-P

Yeah, well in my opinion they certainly didn't think enough about the PITA deployment issues it gives to many people out in the real world...and these are simply going to get worse as the accumulation of versions increases unless they do something to address it.

Opinions are opinions and facts are facts. On my machine running Win-XP SP2 I have .Net 1.1 and 2.0 plus the Feb CTP of WinFX installed and I haven't experienced \*any\* problems running \*any\* 1.1 or 2.0 or WinFX apps.

Well I /have/ – maybe I've just been very unlucky... or maybe you have just been lucky :-)

Either way, my own experience says to me that letting applications float up /can/ bring down a whole world of trouble on your head if some unknown future framework version makes breaking changes...and the solution /anointed by Microsoft/ is tying your application to a specific framework version that you will subsequently always have to either ship or get your customer to download and install themselves.

Re: There is no .NET in Vista Code?

Understand I'm not saying that there may not be some apps that break but I can't confirm your belief that it's a major PITA problem that's gonna get worst.

Well it remains to be seen whether it does get worse or not so we'll have to agree to disagree for now :-)

I rather doubt that I have lessened your worst nightmare fears but at least I've provided some food for thought.

Hey, I'm not having nightmares (I'm a Delphi Win32 guy for non-internal apps) but you .NET acolytes should be (don't get mad, just a little friendly joke)... :-)

.